

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFREY CHAMBERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF HOLLAND and
JUANITA BOCANEGRA,

Defendants.

CASE No. 1:23-cv-779

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

_____/

ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Berens' Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 7) and Plaintiff's Objection to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 8). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, "[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge's recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified." 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997). Specifically, the Rules provide that:

[t]he district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981).

The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the

Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's Objections. After its review, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Berens' Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct.

The Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing this action for failure to state a claim under the screening mechanism of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The Magistrate Judge further recommends the Court bar Plaintiff from filing any further actions relating to Case No. HL-20-086114-OM, regardless of whether he seeks *in forma pauperis* status or pays the filing fee. Plaintiff's objections fail to deal in a meaningful way with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. The Magistrate Judge carefully and thoroughly considered the record and the governing law. The Magistrate Judge properly analyzed Plaintiff's claims. Nothing in Plaintiff's objections changes the fundamental analysis. The Court agrees that Plaintiff's Complaint must be dismissed for the very reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge.

CONCLUSION

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 7) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that should Plaintiff appeal this decision, the Court will assess the \$505 appellate filing fee under § 1915(b)(1); *see McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610-11 (6th Cir. 1997).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall place Plaintiff Jeffrey Chambers on **RESTRICTED FILER** status and that Plaintiff Chambers is hereby enjoined from filing any civil action alleging injury arising out of the proceedings in Case NO. HL-20-086114-OM, regardless of whether he seeks to file as a pauper or pays the filing fee.

Dated: August 25, 2023

/s/ Robert J. Jonker
ROBERT J. JONKER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE